



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/650,880	08/28/2003	Joseph Sheinis	5681-64700	8735

35690 7590 10/05/2006

MEYERTONS, HOOD, KIVLIN, KOWERT & GOETZEL, P.C.
700 LAVACA, SUITE 800
AUSTIN, TX 78701

EXAMINER

SEYE, ABDOU K

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2194

DATE MAILED: 10/05/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/650,880	Applicant(s) SHEINIS ET AL.	
	Examiner Abdou Karim Seye	Art Unit 2194	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 08282003.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-28 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-28 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 28 August 2003 is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☒ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119


- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 07/03/2006.

- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-914)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____


WILLIAM THOMSON
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER

DETAILED ACTION

1. This is the initial office action based on the application filed on August 28, 2003.

Claims 1-28 are currently pending and have been considered below.

Drawings

2. The drawings are objected to as failing to comply with 37 CFR 1.84(p)(5) because they do not include the following reference sign(s) mentioned in the description: "steps 575, 580, 585, 590, 595" as described on fig. 5; and "step 775" as described on fig. 7 of the specification are not shown in figure 5 and 7.

Correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

3. 35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

Claims 20 and 21-28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter. The claims are directed to a signal directly or indirectly, by claiming a medium and the specification recites evidence where the computer storage medium is defined as a "*signal*" (such as a transmission signal). Thus, the claims are directed to a form of energy that, at present, the office consider to be non-statutory subject matter.

Appropriate change is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

4. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter that the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 2, 3, 4, 5, 8, 12, 14, 18, 23, 25, 26 and 27 are rejected under 35

U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Appropriate clarification is required on the following claims:

Claims 3, 8, 12, 16, 17, 19, 20, 21, 25, 26, 27 and 29 recite the limitation "the computer". There is insufficient antecedent basis for the limitations in these claims.

Claims 2,3,4 and 25 recite the limitation "the application component logic". There is insufficient antecedent basis for the limitation in these claims.

Claim 5 recites the limitation "the data". There is insufficient antecedent basis for the limitation in this claim.

Claim 12 recites the limitation "the execution". There is insufficient antecedent basis for the limitation in this claim.

Claims 18 and 27 recite the limitation "the system default locale and translatable table information". There is insufficient antecedent basis for the limitation in these claims.

Claim 26 recites the limitation "the localization logic". There is insufficient antecedent basis for the limitation in this claim.

Claims 8, 14 and 23 contain the trademark/trade name Java. Where a trademark or trade name is used in a claim as a limitation to identify or describe a particular material or product, the claim does not comply with the requirements of 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph (see *Ex parte Simpson*, 218 USPQ 1020; Bd. App. 1982). The claim scope is uncertain since the trademark or trade name cannot be used properly to identify any particular material or product. A trademark or trade name is used to identify a source of goods, and not the goods themselves. Thus, a trademark or trade name does not identify or describe the goods associated with the trademark or trade name. In the present case, the trademark/trade name is used to identify/describe a family of products generated in the proprietary programming language called Java and, accordingly, the identification/description is indefinite.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

5. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

Art Unit: 2194

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

b) The invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

6. Claims 1-28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by **Granade, et al. (US 20020103881)**.

Claim 1:Granade discloses a system/server comprising:

- a. An application component (fig.2 paragraph 31);
- b. Localization logic (fig. 2, paragraph 31);
- c. Interception logic (fig. 2, paragraph 42); and
- d. Method calls (fig. 2, paragraph 42).

Claim 2:Granade discloses a system/server as in claim 1 above and further discloses that the localization logic is separate component (fig. 2, paragraph 31).

Claim 3:Granade discloses a system/server as in claim 1 above and further discloses that the application component is configured to operate on data represented in the system default locale (fig. 2, paragraph 38).

Claim 4:Granade discloses a system/server as in claim 3 above and further discloses that the application component is configure to operate Java Data Base Connectivity (JDBC) methods which is a component of java software language, therefore inherently included in Java (fig. 2, paragraph 42).

Claim 5:Granade discloses a system/server as in claim 1 above and further discloses that the localization logic operates on localized data (fig. 2, paragraph 37).

Claim 6:Granade discloses a system/server as in claim 6 above and further discloses that the localization logic inherently invokes JDBC methods (fig.2 paragraph 42).

Claim 7:Granade discloses a system/server as in claim 1 above and further discloses that the interception logic includes dynamic proxies to intercept method calls (fig. 2, paragraph 42).

Claim 8:Granade discloses a system/server as in claim 1 above and further discloses that the localization logic inherently invokes java calls (fig.2, paragraph 42).

Claim 9:Granade discloses a system/server as in claim 1 above and further discloses that the localization logic invokes translation of currency functions (fig.2, paragraph 38).

Claim 10:Granade discloses a system/server as in claim 1 above and further discloses a metadata file indicating the system default locale and translatable table information for the application component; XML (fig. fig. 2, paragraph 38,41,42).

Claim 11:Granade discloses a method comprising:

- a. Creating a dynamic proxy for an application with localizable parameters (fig. 6/602, paragraph 60);
- b. Modifying a service locator to return an interface to the proxy (fig. 6/604, paragraph 60);
- c. Storing localizable parameters (fig. 6/606, paragraph 60); and
- d. Invoking the localization logic to translate localizable parameters (fig. 6/608,610, paragraph 61).

Claim 12:Granade discloses a method comprising:

- a. Intercepting a method call to an application (fig. Fig. 6, paragraph 62);
- b. Determining whether input parameters are localizable (fig. 7, paragraph 65);
- c. Localizing input parameters (fig. 7, paragraph 64,65);
- d. Invoking method (fig. 7, paragraph 63);
- e. Maintaining a primary data table (fig. 7, paragraph 65); and
- f. Maintaining the localization tables (fig. 7, paragraph 65).

Claim 13:Granade discloses a method as in claim 12 above and further discloses that intercepting includes calling a dynamic proxy (fig. 6, paragraph 62).

Claim 14:Granade discloses a method as in claim 12 above and further discloses that determining includes Java application calls (fig. 2, paragraph 42).

Claim 15:Granade discloses a method as in claim 12 above and further discloses that maintaining of the localized tables inherently from claim 14 includes invoking JDBC methods (fig. 2, paragraph 42).

Claim 16:Granade discloses a method as in claim 12 above and further discloses that maintaining of the data table includes calling application component logic such as synchronization (fig. 2, paragraph 36).

Claim 17:Granade discloses a method as in claim 16 above and further discloses that maintaining of the localization includes calling the localization logic (fig. 2, paragraph 37).

Claim 18:Granade discloses a method as in claim 12 above and further discloses accessing information about the system default locale and translatable table information from a metadata file (fig. 4, paragraph 48).

Claim 19:Granade discloses a method as in claim 12 above and further discloses that intercepting is performed by logic that is separate from logic for executing the method (fig.6, paragraph 62).

Claim 20: A computer accessible medium comprising program instructions to:

- a. Create a dynamic proxy (fig. 6/602, paragraph 60);
- b. Modify a service locator to return an interface to the proxy (fig. 6/604, paragraph 60);
- c. Store localization tables (fig. 6/606, paragraph 60); and
- d. Implement localization logic invoked by the dynamic proxy for translating localizable parameters (fig. 6/608,610, paragraph 61).

Claim 21: A computer accessible medium comprising program instructions to:

- a. Intercept a method call (fig. Fig. 6, paragraph 62);
- b. Determine whether input parameters are localizable (fig. 7, paragraph 65);
- c. Localize input parameters (fig. 7, paragraph 64,65);
- d. Invoke method (fig. 7, paragraph 63);
- e. Maintain a primary data table (fig. 7, paragraph 65); and
- f. Maintain the localization tables (fig. 7, paragraph 65).

Claim 22:Granade discloses a computer accessible medium as recited in claim 21 above and further discloses that the program instructions are executable to call dynamic proxies (fig. 6, paragraph 62).

Claim 23:Granade discloses a computer accessible medium as recited in claim 21 above and further discloses that the program instructions are executable to make Java reflection calls (fig. 2, paragraph 42).

Claim 24:Granade discloses a computer accessible medium as recited in claim 21 above and further discloses that the program instructions are executable to invoke inherently JDBC methods from claim 23 (fig. 2, paragraph 42).

Claim 25:Granade discloses a computer accessible medium as recited in claim 21 above and further discloses that the program instructions of the application component logic are executable to maintain data table (fig. 2, paragraph 36).

Claim 26:Granade discloses a computer accessible medium as recited in claim 21 above and further discloses that the program instructions of the localization logic are executable to maintain the localization data tables (fig. 2, paragraph 37).

Claim 27:Granade discloses a computer accessible medium as recited in claim 21 above and further discloses that the information about the system default locale and translatable table information is stored in an XML metadata file (fig. 4, paragraph 48).

Claim 28:Granade discloses a computer accessible medium as recited in claim 21 above and further discloses that intercepting is performed by logic that is separate from logic for executing the method (fig. 6, paragraph 62).

Conclusion

7. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to the applicant's disclosure.

Banerjee et al (20020188722) discloses a system and method for localization of information in distributed computer environments.

Murren et al (2003/0078960) discloses a architecture and process for creating software applications for multiple domains.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Exr. Abdou Seye whose telephone number is (571) 270-1062. The examiner can normally be reached Monday through Friday from 7:30 a.m. to 4:00 p.m.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, contact the examiner's supervisor, William Thomson at (571) 272-3718. The fax phone number for formal or official faxes to Technology Center 3600 is (571) 273-8300. Draft or informal faxes, which will not be entered in the application, may be submitted directly to the examiner at (571) 273-6722.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the Group Receptionist whose telephone number is (571) 272-3600.


WILLIAM THOMSON
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER

AKS
Sept 18,2006

William Thomson
Supervisory Patent Examiner